

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

OPEDA

(ORGANIZED IN 1929)

Organization of Professional Employees of the U. S. Department of Agriculture

Issued at Washington, D. C., Each Quarter of Calendar Year
VOL. 4 DECEMBER, 1952 NO. 4

Address P. O. Box 381, Washington 4, D. C.

The Executive Committee is pleased to announce the appointment of Leslie T. Mahurin as OPEDA's new Executive Officer. He began his services with us on his birthday, December 15, 1952.

Mr. Mahurin entered the Department service in 1912. After serving in an administrative capacity on four National Forests in Arkansas, Florida and Colorado, he transferred to the Washington office of the Forest Service in 1925 to head its cost accounting functions. He assisted in developing and installing a Bureau system of accounting designed not only to serve budgetary and accounting purposes, but also to provide information for management questions of a character requiring the application of commercial-type accounting principles. In this type of work he was a pioneer. In 1930 he became the Budget Officer of the Forest Service and in 1933 the Regional Fiscal Agent in the Northeastern Region of that Bureau.

After 31 years in the Forest Service he transferred in 1943 to the Office of Budget and Finance in the Department as Chief of the Procurement Management Section, where he served until his optional retirement on December 31, 1950. During this period he had a number of special assignments, both inside and outside the Department. Typical among these were a detail in Mexico to assist in establishing the Foot-and-Mouth Disease program office, a survey for the Budget Bureau in the Washington

YOUR NEW EXECUTIVE OFFICER



LESLIE T. MAHURIN

Supply Center of the Federal Supply Service, and a survey of the administrative supply and property organization of the Mutual Security Administration.

On the more personal side, he was born in Missouri, the "Show Me State." He is the son of a dirt farmer and still loves to grow vegetables and

flowers on the "Back Forty" of his 1½-acre place near Bethesda. Another hobby is the refinishing of antique furniture, of which his wife is likewise a connoisseur. He also has a "regulation pool table" in his recreation room and loves to go fishing, particularly for trout. To use one of his characteristic expressions, "ever what happened," he has continued to hold a keen interest both in his professional career and in his recreations.

In a letter to Mr. Mahurin at the time of his retirement, Mr. Ralph S. Roberts, Director of Finance, wrote to him thus: "In this note I want to say what you already know, that your many contributions toward the effective and efficient administration of the Department's work have been recognized and appreciated by a great many people. Especially do I want to express my personal appreciation for your valued and loyal service these many years. Because of your breadth of experience, your open-mindedness, and the thoroughness with which you undertook and completed your work, you were called upon many times to carry out particularly difficult special assignments not always related to your regular work. We will keenly miss your help in handling some of these tough problems where, in the past, we were able to leave them in your capable hands."

OPEDA is indeed fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. Mahurin as Executive Officer.—B. Ralph Stauber, President.

Performance Standards and Ratings

Mr. JOHN OVERHOLT, Chief of the Performance Standards Section, U. S. Civil Service Commission, was the speaker on OPEDA's second fall luncheon program in November. In introducing Mr. Overholt, President Stauber pointed up the significance of the subject by saying that the matter of performance standards is something with which we are all vitally concerned. "In fact," he continued, "most of us are concerned with it from two points of view—first, as employees, and second, as supervisors. We thought it would be a subject of considerable interest to our membership, and I am sure Mr. Overholt will be glad to have questions.

After welcoming the opportunity to renew old acquaintanceships in the Department, Mr. Overholt referred to his subject as one of much interest not only from the standpoint of mere curiosity, but also from that of administration. He said, "Maybe you have problems of your own and you might have some suggestions. In either case I hope we can help each other."

"The best way to start is to give you a little bit of history. Performance standards and ratings became

necessary because of the evolution from small to large employing units. A single employer hires a man to do a job; he tells him the job to be done; he directs him without difficulty; he can fire him, and he can hire a new man. It is very simple, and no particular procedures are needed. But as business gets bigger and more complicated, the owner has to use more procedures if he wants to make sure that the business prospers, whether that business be conducted to make money, to render services, or some other purpose. Under the corporation type of organization, the stockholders are owners of the business and feel the need of having some systematic pattern of supervision. Government is a big corporation. Most of us are stockholders—taxpayers are stockholders; citizens are stockholders. Our big problem is not to make money; it is to render service. To get a particular service done, someone learned a number of years ago that performance ratings, or efficiency ratings, then called, were a good thing to have. So a law was passed back in 1912 requiring the Civil Service Commission to establish a system of effi-

ciency ratings. It provided for numerous rating levels, one to be eligible for promotion, another before an employee could be demoted, another requiring dismissal for inefficiency, etc.

First Efficiency Rating System

"In 1916 the Bureau of Efficiency was separated from the Civil Service Commission to work on rating systems. Five years later it developed its first system published with the approval of the President. The only trouble was that it applied to only about 1% of the people—those who were on standard types of work. It had two factors or elements: quantity measured on the basis of 100 as average, multiplied by a decimal quality factor. At that time it also had one other effect—it brought about a classification system.

Subsequent Developments

"Later we had a rating system based on 14 elements on a so-called graphic rating scale. It was based on the idea that the supervisor did not 'rate.' He 'reported,' by showing how strong the employee was in particular factors. He reported only on factors

he was told to report on. After the supervisor and his supervisor had checked each of the elements, the rating scale was sent to the Board of Review. The Board applied a secret table of weights, calculated the factors, and totalled tentative decimal ratings. If the Board thought these ratings were too high or too low they could pro-rate them down or up. That worked for a little while until someone got curious. Bill Jones would get his rating and say to his boss, 'I just got my rating, but would like to ask a couple of questions. I got 87.42. Is that pretty good? The fellow across the desk got 88.92. Why would he get more than I?' The supervisor would naturally reply that he only makes the marks on the scale. So when the employee asks the personnel office how they make a rating they tell him it has been scientifically determined; they have a formula; they can't tell him why, but that 'it is right.' This system failed because it was founded on the assumption that supervisors cannot be trusted.

"When this system was superseded it was superseded by another extreme. Instead of having a reliable basis for ratings, we did not have any basis at all. We just indicated by plus, check, or minus marks: plus for strong; minus for weak, and check if neither strong nor weak. This system was so unpopular it brought on a demand for independent boards of review.

The Ramspeck Act

"Under the Ramspeck Act, we had to provide a system for boards of review. That is when we began taking a closer look. We found we had been depending upon ratings to do a job for us, not to help us. We had wasted a lot of time in a search for the magic rating form. We learned there is no substitute for good working relationships between supervisor and em-

ployee. We can not have uniformity of ratings unless we have uniformity of standards. The only way in which we can have intelligent performance standards is to have intelligent working standards, the same standards we use in getting our day to day job done. The idea was developed that we ought to have frequent talks, at least annually, between the supervisor and employee.

The Present System

"There was quite a bit of debate, but finally a law was passed which set up 3 main levels—outstanding, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. The main thing in that Act was that it repealed the old law. It was more of a 'TSI' (timber service improvement) job—letting the young trees have a chance to grow. One unfortunate thing, there was debating about the old mandatory system that required 5 levels and a new system that required only 3.

"What has been our experience? How is this working out? The main thing I want to bring to you is that there is no law or regulation that can work this problem out. The only way in which we can work out good standards is by doing it with our people as we go along. In a lot of places we are going through a system of rating by default. If nothing happens, one is given 'satisfactory.' Most of the people just drift.

"Our main hope is that we can forget the old mandatory system and bring in an opportunity for developing ideas. If we put our minds on the objective of developing good working relations and not put so much emphasis on the form, we can develop ratings that will be of more advantage to us."

After Mr. Overholt finished speaking, the invitation was extended for questions from the floor.

Question Period

Ques. "Has the new system been tested in a major reduction in force?"

Ans. "This new performance rating has just about completed the job of taking efficiency out of reductions in force. Everybody that gets 'satisfactory' gets 1 point."

Ques. "Do you anticipate that the number of 'outstanding' ratings will gradually increase?"

Ans. "Yes, I think so. The reaction has been, I think, that the real need is for an intermediate rating between 'satisfactory' and 'outstanding.' The law is so restrictive that it is hard to get an 'outstanding' rating. Since the law creates the problem, how can we change the law? It requires developing public opinion. Public opinion dictates law."

Ques. "Does the Civil Service Commission have a recommendation for proper form of law?"

Ans. "The Commission has not presented anything on that. Present performance rating plans are sufficient to show whether a person is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, but many employees want some kind of adjective rating with rating levels for rating employees with different degrees of performance. The point we are emphasizing is in talking to individual employees directly to be more specific in telling them how effective they are in their job."

Ques. "Is there any provision under the law to exclude the 'outstanding' rating from this and provide for outstanding recognition in some other way?"

Ans. "That would require some change in law. The law does require that there be 3 ratings, and 'outstanding' is one of them."

The Chairman expressed appreciation to Mr. Overholt for his discussion, and the meeting was adjourned.

Foreign Agricultural Problems

Mr. JOHN J. HAGGERTY, Director of OFAR, was speaker of the day at OPEDA's October luncheon meeting. First, he expressed gratification at being invited to address the OPEDA group. Continuing, he spoke of a number of activities in which he had from time to time been engaged, and concluded that he had finally come into foreign agricultural relations work because, as he put it, he felt that the "spectator sports" were all right for people who like to sit on the sidelines, but they were not for him as he always liked to "get his hands on the ball."

The Opportunity

His last important decision was as to whether he should go to Yugoslavia or to Latin America where he had had several years of personal experience. But he couldn't dismiss Yugoslavia from his mind; it seemed that an American with training in agriculture might be able to perform a real service by joining the embassy staff there and learning how better to understand and interpret that country to America, and America to that country. "As things turned out," he continued, "I

think just that did happen. Because of the 1950 drought in Yugoslavia there was a desperate need for food from some other part of the world and then, as now, the United States was the only country with both the abundance and the heart to give, so that country turned to the United States for aid. The opportunity was thus created and, in a small way, I think I was influential in bringing about improved relationships and understanding between the two countries.

Foreign Trade

"But that is not what I came here to talk about. This inclination or desire that I have always had 'to get my hands on the ball' influenced me to accept the Secretary's offer to leave that service and take on the job I now hold. OFAR is concerned directly with all phases of our relationships that have to do with agriculture in the foreign field, and they are becoming increasingly complex each year. Following World War I they led to the establishment of a Division on Foreign Trade. After that we started sending people abroad to study

foreign agriculture, and particularly markets for American farm products. That service grew from year to year until, in 1939, under the Second Reorganization Act, the agricultural officers were drawn into the Foreign Service establishment of the government, with the title of 'Attachee.' How to deal with the ever changing negotiational situation with the State Department is one of the continuing functions of my office. These deal not only with the agricultural officers in the field, but also with the other foreign service officers in posts where we have no agricultural attachees as such, but where the production and demand for farm crops increases the need for more information.

Developing Markets

"In recent years the importance of this work has taken on a new dimension—particularly in the development of marketing opportunities. At present we have three marketing specialists in Paris for cotton, tobacco, and fruit. They are old hands in the service, known both for their knowledge of the commodities and their familiarity with European markets. They are

there literally to open the doors for our farm products. Our folks in Europe are alert to the tariff situations and are having some success in winning people over and helping the American trade to sell their merchandise in Europe. As distinguished from some years past, when trade was limited to having a good product and going out and selling it, now it is getting to be more and more a case of negotiating with the Ministries of commerce or of the treasury of some foreign government and convincing them that it is in their interest to release the dollars for purchasing American goods.

American Production

"It is important also to realize that since 1940 our production has stepped up about 40%; thus with smaller acreage we are now supporting larger crops. Our whole American economy is therefore particularly vulnerable to the foreign trade situation so that, as at no previous time since the origin of OFAR, we face the necessity of keeping our eyes on the export opportunities for American farm products. Unless we do that we shall again have to face the likelihood of allotments and cut backs. Some of our fruit growers on the West Coast are already faced with the problem of pulling up their trees and using that valuable land otherwise unless we can hold the markets for their fruit. How can we keep those markets open? I assure you that it will require a great deal of effort, both through our representa-

tives here in Washington and our diplomatic attachees abroad.

Technical Assistance

"A growing field in foreign agricultural work is that of technical assistance. I think the great problem of our generation is the fight against the infiltration of totalitarianism. People in many backward countries are now becoming aware as never before that there are places in the world where people do have enough to eat, have their health cared for, and have roofs over their heads. For example, millions of people in Asia have never had the essentials to meet their barest wants, so they offer a fertile ground for totalitarianism. The American way of life holds a great appeal to the billions of people caught under such circumstances. The problem is to convince them that what we have to offer is better for both them and their children than totalitarianism.

Financial Backing

"Strangely enough, the Department of Agriculture, including OFAR, has no direct appropriation for technical assistance work. Formerly we had been operating under an old law by which our employees could be sent to foreign countries and accept pay from them. About 10 years ago a cooperative program with Latin American countries was evolved and a committee on scientific and cultural relations was set up. Thus, although the department has never had the money for this type of work, we have been

able to build up a number of cooperative arrangements with foreign countries. I believe this experience has provided some of the major foundation stones for the President's thinking on the Point Four program. What has occurred is that this experience in Latin America, with its successes and failures, has now been blown up to worldwide dimensions. All over the world there is now a great emphasis on getting things done, but these people expect more of American techniques than it is humanly possible to deliver.

The Outlook

"In many cases the government officials with whom we deal have only a limited control, and sometimes, I am afraid, a restricted understanding of the circumstances involved. Often we find ourselves dealing with the folks on high social and cultural levels. Although these 'higher ups' may be aware of the potential dynamite involved, sometimes they have no concrete ways to offer in approaching these problems. Thus we are up against situations that may require generations to follow through. It will take time to 'get the show on the road' and the program on a firm foundation. There is already a degree of progress, at least in establishing the direction in which they must go. I feel that in agriculture we not only have an opportunity but are under compulsion to take a strong lead in meeting some of these economic, social and cultural problems of the world."

OPEDA'S REVISED "FACT SHEET"

General

1. Membership in the organization does not contravene any law, civil-service regulation, or administrative policy.

2. The constitution of OPEDA states:

"The purpose of this organization is to provide a forum for the discussion of all problems affecting the welfare of the professional employees of the Department; to cooperate with administrative officials, and other agencies interested in the personnel and the work of the Department; and to confer with committees of Congress on matters affecting the personnel of the Department."

3. OPEDA has never been, is not, and will not be a pressure group motivated solely by selfish interest and purpose. Naturally it is concerned with the individual interests of its members, but it is interested not alone in pay for service, but also in service for pay. This means that it aims to promote the most effective public service through the Department, and through the agencies and bureaus comprising the Department.

Field of Action

4. There are three fields in which OPEDA properly and effectively can function: (a) Legislative, (b) Civil Service, (c) Administrative. In each of these fields OPEDA's objectives

will be to endeavor to obtain acceptance of beneficial proposals and to defeat proposals which would adversely affect the interest of its membership.

5. OPEDA provides a fully functioning medium through which professional employees of the Department can collectively and promptly present their views to Department Administrators, to Congress, or to any other appropriate agency concerning any condition affecting their interests.

Accomplishments

6. "What has OPEDA accomplished in the past, and what does it expect to accomplish in the future?" An honest answer requires some qualification. Adjustments of major moment seldom are wholly attributable to any single group but represent rather the composite effort of several or many groups—the correlation of numerous influences and factors. But where a delicate balance exists, action by OPEDA may have contributed or may hereafter contribute to a favorable result not otherwise obtainable, or it may avert an unfavorable result that otherwise might prevail.

Among the movements which OPEDA has effectively championed are:

(a)—Federal retirement program and its various evolutionary revisions.

(b)—Opposition to program of Federal pay cuts originally proposed in 1932.

(c)—Safeguarding of retirement fund against merger with social security program.

(d)—Establishment of 5-day, 40-hour work week.

(e)—Intensive study of and report on conditions of Federal employment.

(f)—Payment for accrued annual leave following death or termination of service.

(g)—President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, 1937-1939.

(h)—Opposition to Walter-Logan administrative law bill, negative to effective administration.

(i)—1945, 1946, 1948, 1949, and 1951 increases in Federal salaries. (In 1951 OPEDA was the only Federal employees' organization to fight the provision which limited the increase to some stipulated lower portion of salary.)

(j)—1949 revisions of Federal classification law.

(k)—1949 revision of per diem and auto mileage law.

(l)—1949 revision of disability compensation law.

(m)—1951 revision of the leave provisions for Federal employees.

(n)—The Committee on Working Criteria developed a report on problems related to making more effective use of the professional staff of the Department. This report was presented to the Assistant Secretary, and at his request to one of the Secretary's Staff Meetings.

Current Objectives

7. Among the objectives currently being sought are:

(a)—Equal pay for equal work—

particularly in respect to equitable provisions respecting overtime pay.

(b)—Elimination of double taxation for Federal employees working in one State but living in another—in particular the support of the Smith Bill (S. 1068—82nd Congress).

(c)—Appropriate recognition of Federal-State cooperative employment towards retirement credit.

(d)—Maintenance of the Civil Service Retirement System as an independent system.

(e)—Equitable adjustments in annuities of retired employees.

(f)—Unemployment benefits for Federal employees.

(g)—Severance pay for Federal employees.

(h)—High standards of performance and integrity for Federal service.

(i)—Salary adjustments appropriate to increases in living costs.

Membership and Organization

8. OPEDA is a thoroughly democratic organization. Its general management is vested in a Council elected annually by the membership, and in an Executive Committee elected annually by the Council.

9. Any permanent employee of the Department of Agriculture, in either the Washington area or the field, who occupies a position in any of the professional grades, or in GS-5 and above (or in certain cases GS-4) is eligible for membership. There are about 34,696 positions in those grades in the Department of Agriculture, including our territories and possessions and foreign countries.

10. As of October 1, 1952, OPEDA's total paid-up membership in good standing was 2,330, of which slightly less than one-third are stationed in the Washington area and slightly more than two-thirds in the field.

11. Of the total membership, over 2,100 occupy positions in GS grades 7 through 18. Among members in good standing are 6 Chiefs and 28 Associate or Assistant Chiefs of bureaus or major agencies, as well as many of the scientists, specialists and technicians eminent in the work of the Department. The membership is preponderantly of men and women now midway in their professional careers.

12. To provide the time and attention requisite to the effective accomplishment of the functions mentioned above, OPEDA has employed an Executive Officer, registered as such in the U. S. Senate and House under the Lobbying Act. It is thus quite proper for him to conduct correspondence with the committees and individual members of the Congress, to testify orally at congressional hearings on pending legislation, and to confer and correspond with the various agencies of the Government with respect to matters affecting the interests of the members of OPEDA. This organization has sought to attain its goals through presentation of objective facts, supported by wide experience and superior judgment, sound reason, and logic. It rejects inflammatory argument and non-cooperation.

13. Through its monthly luncheon

meetings OPEDA provides a forum for the discussion of problems of current interest.

14. Through a quarterly Newsletter, OPEDA reports currently to members on matters of interest, such as findings of its own committees, pending legislation, our recommendations to congressional committees, and related subjects.

15. The sole cost of membership in OPEDA is the annual dues of \$2 per calendar year. No entrance or initiation fee is charged; no special assessments have ever been levied.—Nov. 1952. (Reprints available from OPEDA office.)

In Memoriam

Dr. Melvin C. Merrill

Members of OPEDA were shocked and grieved to learn of the passing of our long time friend and counselor, Dr. Melvin C. Merrill. Dr. Merrill has been a member of OPEDA for many years; he served two terms as President and several months as temporary Executive Officer. We shall miss his faithful service and loyalty. Only a week before his passing he attended an OPEDA luncheon and seemed normally vigorous and cheerful.

Melvin C. Merrill, Ph.D., who retired December 31, 1949, after a quarter of a century's service as Chief of the Division of Publications of the Office of Information, Department of Agriculture, died Monday afternoon, December 22, after a brief illness. He is survived by his wife, Amy Lyman Merrill, a daughter, four grandchildren, and four sisters.

Born April 6, 1884, in Richmond, Utah, a son of Mormon pioneer and Apostle, Marriner Wood Merrill, and Maria Kingsbury Merrill, Dr. Merrill learned early the rigors of farming. He was graduated from the Utah State Agricultural College and later took advanced work at Cornell, the University of Chicago (M.S.), Harvard University (A.M.), and Washington University, St. Louis (Ph.D.). He taught in high school; spent over three years directing the Baguio Experiment Station at Manila (where the world's record 24-hour rainfall of 46 inches was hung up); taught at Idaho Technical Institute; headed the Utah State College Horticultural Department; was Dean of Applied Sciences at Brigham Young University; and was research assistant at Missouri Botanical Gardens.

Dr. Merrill was for several years in charge of the Journal of Agricultural Research, devoted to new and original scientific studies by Department and State agricultural authorities. He has also served as Associate Director of the Department of Agriculture Graduate School, where for 18 years he was in charge of its editorial course and conducted a series of lectures on bulletin writing.

In addition to OPEDA, Dr. Merrill was a member of the Botanical Society of Washington, the Washington Academy of Sciences, the Botanical Society of America, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Audubon Society of the District of Columbia, the Harvard Club, the Torch Club, the University of Chicago Alumni Association of Washington, D. C., and four fraternities—Sigma Nu, Sigma Xi, Gamma Sigma Delta, and Phi Kappa Phi.

OPEDA'S FINANCIAL CONDITION, DECEMBER 31, 1952

Assets

Cash in bank	\$4,410.31
Petty cash	25.00
Total assets	\$4,435.31

Liabilities

Membership dues—1953	2,828.00
Surplus as of December 31, 1952	\$1,607.31

OPERATING RESULTS

Income

Membership dues—1952	\$4,607.00
Contributions	2.25
Total income for 1952	\$4,609.25

Expenses

Salaries	\$2,615.01
Printing and mimeographing	827.91
Addressograph service	197.54
Postage	299.88
Office supplies	28.75
Telephone	27.23
Social Security expense	37.51
Miscellaneous expense	68.96
Total expenses	4,102.79
Surplus for 1952	\$ 506.46
Surplus carried over from previous years	1,100.85
Net surplus as of December 31, 1952	\$1,607.31

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL FOR 1953

<i>Agric. Economics</i>	<i>Ento. & Plant Quar.</i>	<i>Food & Drug Admin.</i>	<i>Prod. & Mktg. Admin.</i>
Charles E. Burkhead*	R. W. Sherman*	Dr. Oral L. Kline*	Clyve W. Jackson*
Jack A. Hamblin*	D. E. Parker*	Dr. Robert A. Osborn†	C. B. Gilliland*
William D. Bormuth†	R. H. Nelson*		Lance G. Hooks†
	Ruth L. Busbey†		
<i>Agric. & Ind. Chem.</i>	<i>Experiment Stations</i>	<i>Foreign Agric. Relations</i>	<i>Rural Elec. Admin.</i>
Dr. Walter M. Scott*	N. F. Farris*	Percy K. Norris*	Everett R. Brown*
Dr. John R. Matchett*	Dr. David Lumsden†	J. Dennett Guthrie†	John H. Scoltock*
Henry A. Donovan†			Alta B. Hamlin†
<i>Agric. Research Admin.</i>	<i>Extension Service</i>	<i>Forest Service</i>	<i>Secretary's Office‡</i>
Dr. E. L. LeClerg*	Luke Schruben*	Perkins Coville*	A. J. McClary*
Ernest G. Moore†	T. Weed Harvey*	Dr. Walter Larrimer*	Robert L. Hill†
	Mrs. Amy Cowing†	Roland Rotty*	
<i>Animal Industry</i>		Miss Doris Hayes†	
Sally I. Miller*	<i>Farm Credit Admin.</i>	<i>Information</i>	<i>Soil Cons. Service</i>
Dr. John J. Martin*	J. Kenneth Samuels*	H. E. Marti*	Eugene J. Peterson*
Dr. Russell Davis†	E. C. Johnson*	Charles M. Arthur†	U. S. Allison*
<i>Commodity Exch. Auth.</i>	R. C. Engberg†	<i>Library</i>	Bert D. Robinson*
R. Corbin Dorsey*		Eli Hareide*	J. C. Dykes†
Mrs. Dorothy Spracher†		Julia S. Merrill†	
<i>Dairy Industry</i>	<i>Farmers Home Admin.</i>	<i>PISAE</i>	
P. D. Watson*	James H. Wood*	William J. Zaumeyer*	
Raymond W. Bell†	Gardner P. Walker*	Carlton S. Garrison*	
	James M. Westby†	Clayton P. Harley*	
		William T. Pentzer†	

RE RECENT COUNCIL ELECTION

There were some complaints from members voting in the recent Council election that single slates were presented on some of the ballots, thus giving the voter no choice.

When names were requested by the OPEDA office for placing on the bal-

lots, it was urged that at least two candidates be furnished for each office; but a few of the bureau nominating committees still came up with only single slates. Also, in order to provide more choice, it was suggested in the ballots that additional names

be written in, but this was done in very few cases.

This situation has occurred year after year and we have always tried to remedy it. There's always hope—perhaps we will succeed in the next election!

* Voting Member

† Alternate

‡ Personnel, B & F, Pl. & Operations and Secretary's Office combined for Council representation

COUNCIL AND LEGISLATION

Following the procedure provided for by the OPEDA constitution "Regular meetings of the Council shall be held in January, May, and October at a time and place designated by the President."

The first meeting of the 1953 Council will take place in January. At this time definite plans will be laid down in some detail as to just what legislative matters shall be presented to the new Congress, to other agen-

cies, or to the general public. Any suggestions you may have along these or other lines may be addressed to your own elected Council members, who are listed on the preceding page, or directly to OPEDA's new Executive Officer, Mr. Leslie T. Mahurin.

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OPEDA's constitution provides that:

"The Council at its January meeting shall elect the following officers: A President, Vice President, Secretary-Treasurer, and six other persons. These, with the immediate past President, and the Executive Officer,

shall constitute the Executive Committee to hold office until their successors are elected.

"The Executive Officer shall be appointed by the Executive Committee."

Pursuant to this provision, a Nominating Committee is now setting up a proposed slate to include all those

above noted except the Executive Officer, who has already been appointed. This Nominating Committee consists of Dean Cochran, chairman, and Walworth Brown, Melvin Buster, Mrs. Amy G. Cowing, E. A. Hallowell, Bennett A. Porter, and Richard G. Schmitt. The Council will cast its vote at the January meeting.

A CHALLENGE TO YOU

OPEDA provides a functioning medium through which its members can collectively and promptly present their views to the Department Administration, to Congress, or to other appropriate agencies concerning all matters affecting their interests.

OPEDA is performing these and other services for YOU, the members. The larger the member-

ship, the greater will become our effectiveness in carrying out these functions for your collective benefit. Will not each of you, then, appoint yourself a "committee of one" to bring in at least one new member to swell our ranks for more effective service? Let "All for One and One for All" become our watchword! Here is an application blank (more available). May we count on you to use it?

APPLICATION BLANK

Organization of Professional Employees of the
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Washington 4, D. C.

Date _____, 195____

Application hereby is made for membership in the Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, the annual dues of which are \$2.00 per year and for which there is no initiation or membership fee.

Name (First name in full: Mr., Mrs., Miss, Dr.)

Bureau _____

Div. or Branch _____

Title _____

Classification: GS-_____

Enclosed is check (), currency (), money order () for \$2.00 for 195____ dues. (Checks or money orders may be made payable to Org. Prof. Employees USDA or simply to O.P.E.D.A.)

(Signature of Applicant)

OPEDA
P. O. Box 381
Washington 4, D. C.


Sec. 34.65(e), P.L.&R.

Miss Louise O. Bercaw
Library

C-12